OZAN SAHIN: Welcome, everyone, to the Monthly RSSAC Teleconference held on the 1st of August 2023. And over to you, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thank you, Hassan. Welcome, everyone. I will call this meeting to order. August 1st, our RSSAC monthly meeting, and we can go right to the roll call. We have a few new RSSAC members here today from DISA and NASA, and we'll give them a chance to introduce themselves shortly here, but won't run through. From Cogent, who do we have? Paul and Brad. Okay. From DISA.

JILL PLACE: Jill Place. Joe Hayes.

KEN RENARD: All right. Welcome Jill and Joe. ICANN?

TERRI MANDERSON: Terry Manderson is here.

KEN RENARD: Good day, Terry. ISC? I know Jeff is out. No Rob. Okay. From NASA? I see Jose from NASA. There's your audio. All right, Jose. From Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Liman is here.

KEN RENARD: Welcome, Liman. All right, NCC? All right. And University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

KEN RENARD: Hey, Karl. USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Both Wes and Suzanne are here today. All right. Welcome. From ARL, myself is here, and I saw Howard as well?

HOWARD KASH: Yeah. Howard is on.

KEN RENARD: All right. And from VeriSign?

BRAD VERD: Yes. Here. Sorry. I couldn't find the mute button.

KEN RENARD: Hi, Brad. And from WIDE? Okay. All right. So, I want to welcome our new appointees from DISA, Joe Hayes. Do you want to give a quick introduction of yourself? Looks like Joe does not have audio hooked up yet. I'll go to Jose. You want to introduce yourself to the group?

JOSE NUNEZ ZAPATA: Sure. Jose Nunez-Zapata, with NASA. I've been with NASA for 20+ years on the office of the CIO. I'm a lead for the network and data delivery services within OCIO, and this function falls under us. So new here, trying to learn some new stuff. So, bear with me if I'm a little slow.

KEN RENARD: No worries. Welcome. And please reach out if you have any questions or anything we can help with. This is a friendly group. Very good people here. And then I guess Brad is also new. He's not on the line. We'll have to think of Brad 1 and Brad 2 here for the group. And did Joe get-- Joe looks like he still does not have audio.

BRAD VERD: Well, and Brad 3 because of Cogent. There is now three of us.

KEN RENARD: That's Brad 3. Oh, boy. Okay. Thanks. We'll, I guess we can go by last initial. All right. As far as the agenda here, we have the agenda on a screen. Anybody have any comments or would like to add anything to the agenda? Okay. If not, we will proceed to administration and off to

Ozan for the draft minutes from the last meeting, which is a vote item today?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken, and hello, everyone. I circulated the draft minutes from the RSSAC July meeting, two weeks ago, and they we didn't receive any comments or questions on these minutes. So, as Ken said, it's a vote item for today. But before going to vote, if there are any discussions on the meeting minutes, I'll stop here.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, Ozan. Any discussion? Just one thing I forgot to mention during the roll call is that we do have a few observers here today. Welcome and welcome to our madness and our family. So, is there a motion to approve the draft minutes?

WES HARDAKER: It's moved.

KEN RENARD: Moved. Thank you, Wes. And in second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Second led by Liman.

KEN RENARD: Liman, thank you. Is there anybody that wishes to object to approving the minutes? Any abstentions? Oh, with that, we'll approve the minutes from the last meeting. Thank you. On to the next topic of the RSSAC caucus membership committee. We have one candidate that the membership committee recommended for acceptance. That's Peter Thomason. I got a chance to meet him last week at ITF real briefly and so the membership committee recommends accepting him. I'll give you guys a minute to look over the SOI and then invite any discussion on Peter. All right. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. I would like to speak in favor of extending membership to Peter. I know him in both ITF contact and the ICANN SSAC. And he's a smart guy who plays well with others, and I think he'd be an asset.

KEN RENARD: Great. Thank you. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Same here. I would also like to speak in favor. This is a person who really knows his DNS and a smart head with a good interface. So, he would be a welcome and useful addition to the group. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Liman. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. In addition to what Suzanne and Liman said, which I support and second, I also would like to note that Peter is an excellent worker and has jumped right into SSAC. And although he's relatively new to SSAC, he and Steve Crocker are co-chairing a work party on DNS Automation. So, he's an ambitious fellow and has already made major contributions to SSAC and I think it would be a big benefit for us to have him in caucus.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, Russ. And Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I also have interacted with him in the context of IETF, and I would recommend him as well.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, everyone. Glowing reviews. Is there a motion to accept Peter Thomas into the caucus, RSSAC caucus?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman.

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry Manderson.

KEN RENARD: All right. And one of you can second or anybody?

WES HARDAKER: I'll second.

KEN RENARD: Second Wes. Thanks. Any objections or further discussion on Peter Thomas? All right. And any abstentions? Great. Thank you. I think Peter will be a great asset to the caucus. Okay. The next item for the caucus is the mailing list subscriptions. This issue came up with respect to, first of all, with respect to non-active members of the caucus wishing to stay on the caucus mail list to keep an eye out, but not necessarily participate. And then the other side of this was people that wanted to join the caucus to keep up with things, maybe either not necessarily qualified, they wanted to learn maybe just joining the mail list. This would be mail delivery to their mailbox as we all get mail.

The idea here is that we'd open up a new type of subscription or a new type of, not really a membership to RSSAC caucus because they would not be full members, they would not participate in work parties and meetings, but they're welcome to observe. And as well, they would not be credited on any authorship. They wouldn't be listed as full memberships members of the RSSAC caucus, to avoid just people trying to pad their resume with memberships here and there. So, Ozan, I'll turn to you if I've forgotten anything about that, and then we can open up the discussion on what people think about this. And then, Ozan, if you could also refresh us on how this would move forward, whether it would require triple zero changes or not.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken, and hello, everyone again. So, I don't really have much to add, Ken. I think what I could add is there was a discussion on this topic in the previous meeting, actually in June meeting, I guess. And the discussion focused on whether to create a new membership type. And now the recommendation from the membership committee is to not create a new membership type, but just to make caucus mailing list open for subscriptions. So, the problem was there are RSSAC caucus members whose presence in the RSSAC caucus is beneficial because of the liaison role they play, or even though they are not actively contributing to the work parties.

So, with that opening, the mailing list for subscriptions, this will be possible even these members are inactive. They don't necessarily need to be RSSAC caucus members, but they can still subscribe to the mailing list and receive emails. So, this is the recommendation from the caucus membership to not create a new caucus membership class or type, but to allow anyone interested to subscribe to RSSAC caucus mailing list. And as next steps, if RSSAC approves that, we will just make it clear on the RSSAC web page that any interested person can have non-posting subscriptions to RSSAC caucus mailing list with non-posting rights. And then, we could also indicate it in the triple zero or operational procedures. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Yes. Thanks. Just noting that the caucus mail list should already be public. Anybody can see it. This change would only be just automatic delivery of those emails in sort of real time. So, two independent things, number 1, taking current caucus members and sort of demoting

them to this observer only role, just the mail list. The other topic would be adding people into the caucus as just the observer as the email subscriber only. So, I'd like to open that for discussion if people have thoughts independently on those two, in favor or against. Terry, please.

TERRY MANDERSON: Thanks, Ken. I think this is a perfectly rational move. It increases the level of transparency. Allowing people to essentially subscribe without posting rights is a good thing, it's a nice thing. And we might find by not removing a member that the membership party has chosen to would normally be removed, we may have them reengage back into the caucus at some future point, which I think is also a good opportunity. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Great. Thank you, Terry. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Daniel, were you in front of me?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Oh, no. Please go ahead, Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. Thanks. I'm having a little bit of trouble figuring out what a new rule about this would accomplish. Given that I think it's within the membership committee's discretion to decide whether somebody is

contributing informally, even if they're not contributing formally. And if it's not within the membership committee's discretion to recommend reappointing somebody. For those reasons, maybe it should be, and then we're done. I'd like to know what others who are here for the earlier discussion think of that because I'm having trouble seeing exactly what a new rule accomplishes.

KEN RENARD: Okay. I'll come back to that. Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. So, I think it's good to not remove people from the mailing list so that we still create a link with those people. Now regarding the non-posting right, I think one of the problems is that they are already not posting. So, I'm wondering if we need to have that restriction of non-posting because we're losing the fact that when the person is going to be interest, he cannot just-- Let's say we're asking for a review of a document, the guy is interested, he won't be able to post that. So, I'm wondering if we can balance what we lose and what we would gain. I think they're already non-posting, so we may not even have to that restriction. So, it's more a question or a comment.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Daniel. To Suzanne. In general, the membership committee just does the parsing of the applications and makes recommendations. It's up to RSSAC to accept or reject a member. This change here of whether the membership committee kicks out somebody that's not

participating or just demotes them to this other status. And, Daniel, from what I hear from your discussion is would we essentially be able to promote somebody from observer role or just mail list subscriber into a full member.

And some of that has to do with qualifications. We do get applications in the caucus membership committee of people that really don't have much DNS experience, some that are just starting out in their careers looking to join just to learn, as well as people that are just applying to pad their resume with this membership and that membership. So that informal role where we're not going to grant the full credentials and all the valor and prestige that comes with joining the caucus to everyone. Liman, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. I've been listening here and I think that we need to zoom out and try to ask ourselves what do we want to accomplish. I am in general a proponent for openness and transparency. So, I think that my stance is what are we trying to prevent here? Are we trying to prevent people from listening? No. Are we trying to prevent people from getting this information delivered to them in a practical way? No. Are we trying to prevent abuse of the mailing list? Yes. Are we trying to prevent people from the riding a free ride on the membership and pimping their CVs? Probably, yes.

And when I evaluate these things, these are my opinions I expressed here, then I arrive at the point that it's probably a good here to do what was actually suggested in the beginning here. Add them to the list, but--

Yes. Add them to the list. And if we start to have problems with the people post too much irrelevant information on the mailing list, let's cross that bridge when we get to it. I am in general for transparency and openness. So, I think we have actually probably benefit from having more people on the list. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thank you, Liman. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Ken. I think it might be useful for us to at least somewhat separate the pieces of the discussion here. I think that Terry's description about the mailing list and how you described it earlier, aligns with the overall philosophy that we've been pushing in RSSAC for the last several years of openness, transparency, and so forth. So, if we separate the question of can anyone subscribe to the mailing list on a read-only basis and take that as a separate question, I think what I've heard in the discussion, pretty much there's strong support for that. It's the other question with respect to membership and active or inactive, or should someone be taken off that is the stickier question. So, would it be better to first decide about whether or not the mailing list can be subscribed to on a read-only basis by anyone and then discuss the other parts afterwards? Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Russ. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Old hand.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks. So, it seems to me, yeah, there's no objection to anyone joining read-only. There's been some comments, well, if they're joining read-only, why not let them post? And then the idea of demoting somebody. We certainly do want to keep inactive members out of the caucus if they've moved on, if they forgot to cancel their membership, whatever, if they're no longer interested in the role there should be a way out. So, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Can I suggest the way forward here? I'm always fascinated with the amount of time we spend on topics like this. Can we go forward with the recommendation and then reassess at a later date on how it's working out? I feel like we're trying to boil the ocean right now, and it seems that it just feels like we're trying to solve everything for everybody. And what I think the recommendation is is what Terry said, which is very reasonable, reasonable approach, see how it goes, and we can reassess. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: All right. I see a thumbs up from Liman as well. I like that, Brad. Yeah, we're not committing ourselves, but we are certainly starting to overengineer this. All right. Any other topics, any other conversation on the mailing of subscription we could take that to the RSSAC mail list too as well? We'll discuss this in the admin committee and probably

move forward with what Brad was just suggesting. Let's do it. We'll reassess it and see how well it's going.

All right. On to work items, we have our RSSAC001 Version 2. That document has been stable in the caucus as well as in RSSAC. Thank you, Duane, for leading that work party. That's been stable. It's up for vote and acceptance at this point. Is there a motion to approve Version 2 of RSSAC001?

WES HARDAKER: Moved.

KEN RENARD: Wes, thank you. A second.

LARS-JIHAN LIMAN: Seconded by Liman.

KEN RENARD: Liman, thank you. Are there any objections to approving RSSAC001 Version 2? Any abstentions? All right. Thank you. So, we've approved RSSAC001 Version 2. Again, thanks Duane.

The next work item is the security incident reporting work party. This work party met Yesterday for its second meeting. We talked about various topics throughout the statement of work, lots of different ideas floating around and tried to center the discussion on point 2 of the statement of work, which was what comprises what is a reportable

incident. We got a little bit meta. We got a little bit specific. What kind of came out of that was that in order to focus in and try and see the bigger picture, let's dive into just some examples, pick two at this point, really try very hard not to go down the rabbit hole and get into the specifics because we want to keep this high level.

So, use those two examples as to walk through and then try and abstract and make generalizations about incident reporting. Those two topics were 1, invalid or bad DNS signatures being published by their RSS. The other scenario was the typical scenario we think of is the denial-of-service attack. So, some level of inavailability of the RSS based on that. So, I encourage folks to join in on that work party. It's interesting and lots of cool stuff to discuss. And the next meeting for that group will be not next week, but the following Monday, so two weeks from yesterday. Is that 14th, 13th, something like that? Here. Yeah, it should be the 14th and that is at 1500 UTC. All right. And on to RSSAC000. Daniel.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All righty. Good morning from LA, everybody. It's the time of the year where we kick off a review of the RSSAC operational procedures. I've gone ahead and started a draft RSSAC000 Version 8. Things that staff have tracked so far this year that, well, the RSSAC will need to discuss. The first was adding the observer type of participant to the mailing list. I've already gone ahead and noted on our list that this is going to be implemented on a trial basis and that may not be added to the operational procedures during this round.

The second item is reviewing the elections procedures that were updated during Version 7. One thing that's been noticed throughout this year is that current version of triple 0 does not account for selecting more than one candidate in a position. So, it doesn't allow for multi winter selection. So that's something that we need to take a look at and add into the operational procedures. And then there's one editorial thing that Ozan and I have already commented as a track change. Correcting a new section reference title.

Other than that, there's nothing else that staff has tracked throughout the year, but, of course, the operational procedures will be open for discussion. Ozan after this meeting will be sending out a Doodle invite for the first discussion. Or, Ozan, do we put it out to the mailing list first to see what discussion what review comes back and then schedule a session?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I can send a note with the link to this draft update and also a link to a Doodle poll so that we can schedule the first call.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Awesome. Thank you so much, Ozan. Any questions or comments? All right. Back over to you, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Daniel. Any discussion on any of the work items, the work parties, the documents? If not, we'll move on to the reports from the chair, vice chair, the ICANN78 planning is still in its kickoff mode. Right

now, it's f looking at block schedules. Just thinking off the top of my head, RSSAC will likely have its regularly monthly meeting during ICANN78, possibly a session on messaging, which could be a closed RSSAC session. And I anticipate the work party for the security incident reporting having a session as well. And Brad is GWG chair. If there's anything we can do in RSSAC to help scheduling, please let us know, and I'd be happy to accommodate, more time for GWG.

BRAD VERD: Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Wes, from the ICANN Board, any words of wisdom?

WES HARDAKER: Not really this month. It's been a fairly quiet month of stuff that's not relevant to RSSAC. August is looking to be pretty quiet too, but we do have a Board workshop coming in the beginning of September, and so I suspect I will have a lot more to report come the October meeting. As always, fundamental concentration of the Board remains on the SubPro next round gTLD discussions as we get closer and closer to getting actionable and implementable recommendations.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Wes. For the CSC, the July report has not been published yet. I expect another nice boring report. Some of the items up for discussion are within the CSC is to update their procedures to specify alternates

from each of its groups not only the membership, which is actually pretty small, the voting membership is pretty small, but the liaisons as well, having alternate members. It's been tough getting attendance at some of the CSC meetings on online, especially this time of year, but that's where that is. And next is the NomCom. I don't see [inaudible - 00:29:41] here. Okay. Daniel, over to you for RZERC and IAB.

DANEL MIGAULT: Hi. So, I have nothing to report for the IAB. But for RZERC, I sent an email just now on RSSAC mailing list. We will have a meeting on August 15. And if there is any specific topic RSSAC is willing us to discuss or, I mean, before discussing those, I need to present those and then probably need to be accepted. But feel free to propose any topic that you would like RZERC to work on.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Daniel. Any questions for Daniel on IAB or RZERC? All right. Then over to Russ for SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Ken. So just a couple of quick items. The upcoming meeting. We will be scheduling in the joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting and if there are any particular topics beyond what we usually cover that anyone is interested in or wants to discuss, please let me know or chairs or co-chair or our chair or vice chair, and we'll make sure it gets on the agenda.

The other item is the DNSSSEC and security workshop. The call for participation is out. So, if anyone has any topics that they think would be of interest to the community, we're taking inputs right now, and, still, it's early enough. We have some slots yet. So, please think about what the community might be interested in hearing from you and send a suggestion in. That's all I have today. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Russ. IANA Functions Operator, James.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi, Ren. Not much to report. IANA ran their key ceremony last in July 19th, to continue the replication off the key generated in the previous ceremony. Prior to that ceremony, we sent out an announcement. Basically, yeah, was to sort of say paraphrasing, noting that we would sort of pause external facing changes to do with that key. So, we wouldn't publish that key in the trust anchor file. And that's because of this HSN vendor replacement project that is underway. The vendor we're using is decommissioning their products. So, we think that that's going to require a rollover. And so, instead of running sort of two rollovers in quick succession, we're looking at our options here. So, I'll speak more news in the coming months as to what how that we think all that's going to pan out and as we take that to be clear. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thank you, James. Any questions for James or Russ? All right. I don't think we have Duane this month from RZM. Brad, or anybody want to say anything about the GWG? '

BRAD VERD: I don't think there's any new update to share here unless there are questions.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks. All right. Now any other business. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 5th. That is during the ICANN DNS Symposium and OARC meetings. But the decision was made to keep that there. If my time zone math is correct, that'll be 9:00 pm in the local time zone. So, those that are at those meetings can join at the bar in the evening. And with that, any other business that anyone wants to bring up? All right. Hearing none, thank you all for your participation. Ozan, do you have anything? Any last words?

OZAN SAHIN: No. Thank you, Ken.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, everyone. With that, meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]